



Docket No.: 03188/100H005-US1
(PATENT)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:
Richard Ruben et al.

Application No.: 09/704,322

Confirmation No.: 4924

Filed: November 2, 2000

Art Unit: 3629

For: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR MANAGING
REAL ESTATE

Examiner: N. Vig

APPEAL BRIEF

MS Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This is an appeal from the Final Rejection of April 6, 2005. The Notice of Appeal was filed on August 5, 2005. A one month extension of time is requested, November 5, 2005 being a Saturday.

The fees required under § 41.20(b)(2) are dealt with in the accompanying TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF.

(1) REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The named real party in interest for this appeal is the applicant, Richard Ruben, and the invention is utilized by Workspeed, Inc. of New York, New York.

11/10/2005 FMETEKI1 00000006 09704322

02 FC:2402

250.00 0P

{W:\03188\100H005US1\00513545.DOC *03188100H005US1* }

(2) RELATED APPEALS, INTERFERENCES, AND JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS

There are no other appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.

(3) STATUS OF CLAIMS

A. Total Number of Claims in Application

There are 27 claims pending in the application, these being claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-29.

B. Current Status of Claims

All of the claims are on appeal, that is claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-29. Claim 1 is the main independent claim.

(4) STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

The subject application is prosecuted under the RCE filed on March 15, 2004 in which a Final Rejection was made on the first Office Action dated April 6, 2005. The first Office Action Final Rejection also cited and applied a new reference. Applicant chose to respond to the Final Rejection and filed the Notice of Appeal. Therefore, there are no outstanding amendments to be considered.

Applicant requests that claim 29 be considered as amended to be dependent from claim 10 instead of claim 1.

(5) SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

All of the claims on appeal depend, directly or ultimately, from main claim 1. To explain the invention, the specific language of claim 1 is set forth below in italics in centered paragraphs. Comments follow describing what the language means to explain the invention. Letter identifications of such paragraphs are added to the claim and are used in the Argument Section (7). The pertinent portions of the drawings and Specification are noted.

The subject invention is directed to a method of managing a real estate property, such as an office building that is primarily automated and computer based. The method integrates into

the management protocol the feature of making requests for services by persons with specified limits of authority and monitoring and reporting the fulfillment status of such requests. Claim 1 recites the following:

(a) *A method of managing a real estate property comprising the steps of:*

The method is directed to managing a real estate property (page 1, lines 9-15; page 3, line 16 - page 4, line 20). This is typically an office building that has one or more tenants.

(b) *establishing the lease parameters of the property in a computer database;*

There is a computer database in which is entered the lease parameters, i.e., the space, tenant, lease terms, etc. (Fig. 1, S130; page 11, line 10 - page 12, line 9).

(c) *setting in a computer database at least one user profile of at least one tenant entity located in the property and a property manager entity related to management of the property;*

(Fig. 1, S132; page 12, line 17 - page 13, line 10; page 14, lines 3-14; page 15, lines 5-9; page 16, Table 1.) A tenant entity, for example, ABC Consulting Company, is located in the property. For the ABC Consulting Company tenant entity, a user profile would be that of one or more of the managing partner, the administrator, or office manager. The real estate property manager entity, for example, XYZ Property Management Company, manages the property and may or may not be resident on the property. The user profile of the property manager entity is of the person(s) having management responsibility for the property, e.g., John Smith. User profiles for at least one tenant entity and a property management entity are set into the computer database.

(d) *establishing in a computer database at least one vendor entity for the property and the service performed by a said at least one vendor entity;*

Various vendors are to perform services for the property. (Fig. 1, S132; page 15, lines 9-12; page 16, Table I.) Such vendors can be, for example, electricians, plumbers, cleaning services, etc. One or more of such entities and the services each performs is set into the computer database. For example, Sparky Electrical Co. (vendor entity) - electrical services (services).

(e) assigning in a computer database the attributes of the authority of a user of at least one of said tenant entity and property management entity relative to requesting a service for the property;

Various attributes of authority are assigned to a user of the tenant entity and user of the management entity. (Fig. 1, S140; page 16, line 19 - page 17, line 2; page 17, lines 11-15; page 18, line 4.) In the ABC Consulting Company example, the office manager can be assigned attributes of requesting services from one or more specific vendor entities, or from only vendor entities that render certain types of services, or all vendor entities. A monetary limit attribute also is normally assigned. Perhaps the consulting company does not want the office manager to be able to request one or more specific services, such as plumbing, or to request these services above a certain dollar amount. Therefore, the office manager would not be assigned these attributes. Perhaps only the consulting company administrator can request cleaning services, and he/she would be assigned that attribute of authority. The user of the property management entity is assigned similar attributes of authority, such as specifying vendor type, vendor entity and dollar limitations. (Page 19, lines 10-15; Fig. 1, S142; page 23, line 1 - page 25, line 12.)

(f) a said user of a tenant entity or property manager entity making a request for a service to be rendered for the property;

The user of a tenant entity or property management entity makes a request for a service to be performed by a vendor. (Page 21, line 19 - page 22, line 14; page 23, line 1 - page 25, line 12; page 27, lines 11-13; page 28, lines 1-9; page 29, lines 17-25.)

(g) routing the request for service to one of said at least one vendor entity established in said computer database;

The request inherently must be within the scope of the assigned attribute to be accepted. The request for services is routed in the computer database to the appropriate vendor entity. That is, for example, the computer routes requirement for electrical services to a vendor of electrical services established in the database. (Page 28, line 14; page 30, lines 4-11; page 31, lines 9-13.)

(h) maintaining the status of the fulfillment of the service request; and

The status of fulfillment of the service request is maintained. (Page 27, line 15; page 30, lines 11-14; page 31, line 14 - page 32, line 19.) That is, data is maintained regarding the fulfillment status of the request such as when the service is to be performed, how much of the work is completed, money expended, etc.

(i) *communicating the status of the fulfillment of the service request to the user of the entity requesting the service.*

The user making the service request is provided with information of the status of fulfillment of the request. (page 31, line 5 - page 32, line 10.)

As seen, applicant's system is fully integrated in the computerized management of a property. It gives both a tenant and property manager the ability to make requests for services within specified limits of authority (attributes), routes such a request to the appropriate vendor, tracks fulfillment status of the requested services, and provides the status information to the person making the request.

(6) GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Are claims 1, 3-4, 6-8, 10-24 and 27-29 properly rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the combination of the BuildingLink.com article ("BuildingLink") in view of BJM Central publication ("BJM") and Shavit, et al., U.S. 4,799,156 ("Shavit")? The Shavit patent was newly cited in the Final Rejection. Claim 1 is the sole independent claim and the combination of the three references is applied against it.

Is claim 25, which depends directly from claim 1, properly rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the combination of BuildingLink in view of BJM and Shavit, and further in view of the article "Examples of Using MQSeries ("MQSeries")?

Is claim 26, which depends directly from claim 1, properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the combination of BuildingLink in view of BJM and Shavit, and further in view of Zeanah, et al, U.S. 5,933,816 ("Zeanah")?

Claims 28 and 29 were objected to as both reciting the same limitations. This is correct and was due to a typographical error. It is requested that claim 29 be considered as being dependent from claim 10. Claim 29 is presented in amended form in Appendix A.

(7) ARGUMENT

1. The Rejection Relies Largely On Hindsight
Based On Applicant's Own Disclosure

Applicant respectfully submits that the detailed Final Rejection is built on a weak foundation (the principal BuildingLink reference) to which is added the secondary BJM and Shavit references. The Examiner surgically extracts broad concepts and language of data processing technology from the secondary references on a pick-and-choose basis and assembles them in an illogical manner using as the glue only a large quantity of hindsight taken from the disclosure of the application.

2. The Examiner's Application Of The Prior Art Is Not
Logical And Does Not Meet The Claim Limitations

✓ In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner first address the vendor tracking aspect of clauses (a), (d), (f) and (g) of claim 1 based on the principal BuildingLink reference. He then backtracks to clauses (c) and (e) directed to providing attributes of authority to a person to make a request to the vendors in the database. This is an important part of the overall integrated method of the invention.

Applicant argues the rejection of the claims in a point by point confrontation of the Examiner's application of the prior art against main claim 1. The Examiner's assertions from the Final Rejection of April 6, 2005, pages 5-6, are presented in single space, centered. The Examiner's position, beginning at page 5 of the Final Rejection, and applicant's refutation follows.

Regarding claim 1, BuildingLink teaches system and method
for a managing real estate property. BuildingLink teaches:

The BuildingLink document is basically a sales flyer taken from the Internet. Of its eight pages, only page 4 of this reference has any content of significance. Page 4 sets forth a list

of features, each described only by a few words, that BuildingLink is supposed to be able to perform. No details are given on how performance is accomplished.

The Examiner, skipping to claim 1, clause (g) as a starting point, continues:

routing the request for service to one of said at least one vendor entity (submit and track maintenance and repair request) [page 4].

There is no teaching in BuildingLink of establishing the vendor entities as set forth in claim 1, clause (d) or as to how or by whom the request is made. Also, claim 1, clauses (e) and (f) recite establishing attributes of authority of those permitted to make requests and how they are made.

The subject matter in parentheses above is the Examiner's direct quote from BuildingLink page 4 and is the only teaching relative to claim 1 clause (g). The operative verb "routing" of the claim and "submit" of BuildingLink have different meanings. As seen from the dictionary definition of Exhibit A, "routing" is based on the term "route", i.e., to send in a particular direction. This is consistent with the invention in that a request for a particular type service, e.g., electrical, is routed by the computer to an electrician vendor in the computer database of vendor entities (claim 1, clause (d)). The dictionary definition of "submit", as shown by Exhibit A, means only to "propose". But submit to who? The building manger, the owner, the government? There is no teaching in BuildingLink of the step of setting up the vendor entities in the database and the services performed by such vendor (claim 1, clause (d)), and routing a requested service to the appropriate vendor entity in the database. Therefore, how can BuildingLink satisfy the step of "routing"?

Clearly the few words of the BuildingLink document do not provide any teaching of how a request for service is routed to the appropriate vendor in the database. As noted below, the Examiner later specifically admits that BuildingLink does not teach the step of "routing". This amply demonstrates the impropriety of the rejection.

The Examiner next states:

maintaining the status of the fulfillment of the service request (submit and track maintenance and repair request) [page 4]; and

The use of the term "track" in BuildingLink is open-ended. It could mean nothing more than submit the request and learn that it has been completed. The term "fulfillment" used in claim 1 means following the complete course of accomplishing the requested work from the vendor selected from the database. The latter is totally absent from BuildingLink.

The rejection continues:

communicating the status to the entity requesting the service (submit and track maintenance and repair request, e-mail capability) [page 4].

While BuildingLink might have e-mail capability, there is no teaching of integrating the e-mail into the system to keep the (authorized within attributes) person requesting the service (routed to the appropriate vendor in the computer database) advised of the fulfillment status of the request.

The Examiner's analysis continues:

BuildingLink does not teach establishing the lease parameters of the property in a computer database.

Now the Examiner jumps to one of the secondary references to attempt to meet the feature of clause (b) of claim 1.

However, BJM teaches system and method for establishing the lease parameters of the property in a computer database (Lease expiration and Renewal Notice) [page 12]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify BuildingLink as taught by BJM to have the system and method to enhance the capability of the system and perform additional functions for building management.

The BJM reference (page 12) only refers to the lease expiration and renewal dates. Applicant does not dispute the singular aspect that establishing lease parameters of a property in a database is old. However, BJM does not consider other factors that are related to the method of claim 1 including the relationship between the lease parameters and the services that are to be performed by the various vendor entities (claim 1, clause (d)) and the attributes of the tenant and property manager entities able to request such services (claim 1, clauses (c) and (e)). Therefore,

even if BJM is combined with BuildingLink, the result falls far short of teaching or suggesting the fully integrated method of claim 1, as discussed above, wherein vendor service requests:

1. are made by authorized person (user) of a tenant or management entity;
2. the requests of 1. are made within the assigned attributes of such user;
3. the request is matched to a list of vendors in a database;
4. the vendor maintains the fulfillment status of the request; and
5. the fulfillment status is communicated to the user making the request.

The Examiner's conclusion that it would be obvious to modify BuildingLink's scantily disclosed method to incorporate lease parameters to "enhance the capability of the system and perform additional functions for the building management" is a bold statement. But where are the enhancements and additional functions taught? There is no teaching of any of the features and function of claim 1. BJM simply does not integrate into or with any of the features of the BuildingLink method.

Next, the Examiner contradicts his previous position that BuildingLink's use of term "submit" equals the step "routing" of claim 1 by stating:

BuildingLink does not teach routing the request for
service to one of said at least one vendor entity
established in a computer database.

He now jumps to another secondary reference, the newly cited patent to Shavit, to attempt to meet this feature (claim 1, clause (g)) of the integrated method of the invention.

However, Shavit teaches system and method which permits
concurrent interactive business transaction sessions between
different users [Shavit, abstract]. Shavit teaches vendor entity
established in computer database (business choice, Shavit
teaches "users who subscribe to service") [Shavit, Fig. 2, and
disclosure associated with Fig. 2].

The newly cited Shavit reference broadly teaches a system and method of how to manage business transactions. It is replete with drawings and discussion of how various entities,

such as financial institutions, freight agents, buyers, wholesalers, etc., can interact via communication systems and a computer.

The Shavit patent has 57 pages including 31 drawings. Nowhere is the term "real estate" mentioned.

The Examiner refers to Fig. 2 of Shavit and its description. Fig. 2 is designated as "a generalized block diagram illustrating the organizational relationship between market participants and the intuitive market management according to the invention". The description of Fig. 2 begins at column 7. But nowhere in this description is there even the remotest mention of anything like managing a real estate property, tenants in a real estate property, a list of vendors to perform services for the property, setting attributes for a tenant and/or property manager, etc. Thus, there is no basis for combining Shavit with any of the references directed to real estate. Even if the combinations is improperly made, it still does not meet the terms of claim 1.

The Examiner continues:

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify BuildingLink as taught by Shavit to allow users to check status any time user wishes to check the status (24/7 status check capability). For example, United Parcel Service (UPS) allows their customers to check status of their package.

This is relatively meaningless as directed to the integrated subject method of claim 1. Checking the status of a UPS package has nothing to do with managing a real estate property. Further, how is this combined with BuildingLink?

Next the Examiner contends that:

BuildingLink in view of BJM and Shavit teaches:
setting in a computer database at least one user profile of at least one tenant entity located in the property and a property manager entity related to management of the property (access building wide address book) [page 4]:

The Examiner does not and cannot point to any specific teaching in any of the references of a user profile of at least one tenant entity located in the property and at least one property manager entity relative to the management of the property. This establishes the basis for the later claimed step of assigning attributes of authority to these users.

The relevant line item (the seventh line) of BuildingLink (page 4) reads "Access Building-wide Address Book". While BuildingLink might have an address book, an old feature, it does not use the address book (database in claim 1) for the next several of the claimed features addressed by the Examiner.

Continuing:

establishing in a computer database at least one vendor entity for the property and the service performed by said at least one vendor entity (submit and track maintenance and repair request) [page 4]

The BuildingLink publication is clearly devoid of this teaching. The snippet "submit and track" from BuildingLink does meet the specifically claimed feature of establishing in a database at least one vendor entity and the services performed by such vendor entity. To whom does BuildingLink "submit" the request and how is it "submitted"? This feature of claim 1 again highlights the integrated nature of the method when a request for services is routed to a vendor in the database capable of performing the services. This feature is nowhere disclosed or suggested in BuildingLink.

The next point discussed by the Examiner is:

assigning in a computer database the attributes of the authority of the a user of at least one of said tenant entity and property management entity relative to the requesting a service for the property (features customized per building or resident and repaid request) [page 4]

It is a tremendous jump across the open space of no teaching, suggestion or motivation, to reach the Examiner's position based on a single line (line 11) of BuildingLink which reads "Features Customized for Building or Resident". It is not seen how the Examiner can come to the conclusion that "features customized" meets the specifically claimed limitation (claim 1, clause (e)) of "assigning in a computer database the attributes of the authority of the

user of at least one of said tenant entity and property management entity relative to the requesting a service for the property" above. The travel medium for the Examiner's free space leap can only be applicant's own disclosure.

Next, the Examiner addresses:

a said user of a tenant entity or property manager entity making
a request for a service to be rendered for the property (submit
and track maintenance and repair request)[page 4]

In the abstract world, BuildingLink probably does permit a tenant or property manager to request a service. But this totally neglects the integrated nature of the claimed method in which such tenant and/or property manager must have a defined attribute of authority that permits the request to be made and the routing of the request to the proper vendor entity in the database. All of the clauses of claim 1 are inter-related and build and depend on each other. The Examiner totally neglected this.

The Examiner's rejection of claim 1 concludes with:

communicating the status of the fulfillment of the service
request to the user of the entity requesting the service (the
system 50 also allows the supplier to provide its customers
with an on-line interactive sales service providing immediate
quotations, confirmations, and status information) [Shavit
col. 15, lines 45-48].

It does appear that Shavit provides two-way communication between a customer and a supplier. But again, applicant questions where is there any glimmer of a mention in Shavit how to manage a real estate property based on all of the steps recited in claim 1?

Clearly, claim 1 sets forth a novel and advantageous method that when considered in its entirety is not shown or suggested by the combination of references. Therefore, claim 1 is clearly patentable and should be allowed.

3. The Other Claims In The Application Depend From Claim 1
And Are Also Clearly Patentable.

The Examiner rejects the dependent claims 3-4, 6-8 and 10-24 mostly with statements that BuildingLink shows this feature or that such a feature would be obvious.

The principal point to be considered is that the rejection of the dependent claims is built on a non-existent foundation since, as demonstrated above, there is no teaching or suggestion in the references of the complete, novel integrated method of main claim 1. In essence, the broadly stated obviousness rejection of the dependent claims is primarily one of hindsight application of various features of applicants' invention.

Giving a few examples of this, the Examiner rejects claim 3 with the summary statement that BuildingLink in view of BJM and Shavit teaches assigning at least one attribute of authority (type of requirement for service that can be made, amount of request, etc.) to an owner entity. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner specifically point out what part of any of the references even suggests assigning an attribute of authority. Claims 6, 7, 8 and 19 address the setting of authority attribute to any one or more of the tenant entity, property management entity, vendor entity or user entity. The Examiner's contention that the three references disclose any one of these steps is just wishful thinking.

Claims such as 22, 23 and 25 give further detailed features of the step of routing the service requests (made by one with the requisite attribute of authority). The "submit and track" disclosure of BuildingLink relied on by the Examiner is not enough to meet the added features of these claims.

Because the basic rejection fails relative to main claim 1, it also fails as to all the dependent claims.

4. Dependent Claim 25 Clearly Is Patentable.

Claim 25 is rejected as obvious over BuildingLink in view of BJM and Shavit and further in view of MQSeries. Claim 25 depends from claim 1 and sets forth the further feature of a computer being programmed to generate requests for services that are routed to a vendor in a database. That is, the computer used in the invention can be scheduled to generate vendor requests (page 33, lines 6-18). The Examiner relies on the added MQSeries for this feature.

First, as discussed above, BuildingLink, BJM and Shavit do not meet the basic subject matter set forth in main claim 1. MQSeries is a ten or so year old software program developed by IBM to run on IBM proprietary technology (probably now totally obsolete). The Credit Check application of this reference is completely irrelevant to the overall method set forth in claim 25.

In essence, the Examiner combines a broad aspect of an unrelated general computer system to the specific method set forth in claim 25. This is totally improper. Also, even if the combination is improperly made, it does not teach or suggest the novel invention of main claim 1. Therefore, claim 25 also is patentable.

5. Dependent Claim 26 Also Is Patentable Over The References.

Claim 26 depends from claim 1 and further recites the step of establishing a list of services available for the property in a database and attributing work processes and business rules to the various services of the list (page 31, lines 10-15). The claim is rejected over BuildingLink in view of BJM and Shavit, and further in view of Zeanah, et al., U.S. 5,933,816.

The Examiner relies on Zeanah for the additional features of claim 26. Again, as discussed above, the combination of references do not meet the novel features of main claim 1, and the addition of Zeanah does not cure this basic defect. In applying Zeanah, the Examiner says "However, Zeanah teaches establishing a list of services available for the property in a computer database, attributing work . . ." (column 12, lines 53-60).

First of all, this is not what is written in the Zeanah patent and, second, it appears to be a misunderstanding of what is disclosed. The Zeanah patent text (column 12, lines 53-60) does not mention the term "Property". It precisely says "obtains lists of possible services available from services registry component". This part of the Zeanah patent actually describes the technical architecture of a software component allowing a user to select any specific application that has been created or plugged in the Zeanah shell. This type of software component is low level, completely generic, exists in all modern software, and has absolutely nothing to do with actual buildings, properties, work orders, service requests, etc. It further demonstrates the Examiner's overreaching in applying the reference.

Accordingly, the combination of references made by the Examiner does not render the subject matter of claim 26 obvious and it also should be allowed.

(8) CLAIMS

A copy of the claims involved in the present appeal is attached hereto as Appendix A.

(9) EVIDENCE

No evidence pursuant to §§ 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or entered by or relied upon by the Examiner is being submitted. Exhibit A, having two dictionary definitions, is attached.

(10) RELATED PROCEEDINGS


No related proceedings are referenced in (2) above. Therefore, no copies of decisions in related proceedings are provided and no Appendix is included.

SUMMARY

All of the claims on appeal have been shown to contain novel and advantageous subject matter that clearly distinguishes over the combination of references, even if improperly made. Therefore, the Examiner should be REVERSED and all of the claims of this application should be allowed.

Dated: November 7, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Gordon D. Coplein

Registration No.: 19,165

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant

{W:\03188\100H005US1\00513545.DOC *03188100H005US1* }

APPENDIX A**Claims Involved in the Appeal of Application Serial No. 09/704,322**

1. (Previously presented) A method of managing a real estate property comprising the steps of:
 - establishing the lease parameters of the property in a computer database;
 - setting in a computer database at least one user profile of at least one tenant entity located in the property and a property manager entity related to management of the property;
 - establishing in a computer database at least one vendor entity for the property and the service performed by a said at least one vendor entity;
 - assigning in a computer database the attributes of the authority of a user of at least one of said tenant entity and property management entity relative to requesting a service for the property;
 - a said user of a tenant entity or property manager entity making a request for a service to be rendered for the property,
 - routing the request for service to one of said at least one vendor entity established in said computer database,
 - maintaining the status of the fulfillment of the service request; and
 - communicating the status of the fulfillment of the service request to the user of the entity requesting the service.
2. Canceled.
3. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1 further comprising setting a user profile of an owner entity related to the property and assigning at least one attribute of authority to said user of said owner entity.

4. (Previously presented) The method of claim 3 wherein there is at least one user for each of the owner entity, property manager entity and tenant entity.

5. Canceled.

6. (Previously presented) The method of claim 3 wherein in the setting step one person is set as a user in two or more of the entities.

7. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1 wherein in the setting step a principal user of an entity is assigned the attribute of being able to assign or change the attributes of a another user of the same said entity.

8. (Previously presented) The method of claim 7 further comprising the step of setting in a computer database a user profile of a system administrator entity, and assigning a user of the system administrator entity the attribute of authority to change the attribute of authority of a user of a tenant entity of the property.

9. Canceled.

10. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1 further comprising the step of providing communication capability between users of the property manager entity, tenant entity and vendor entity.

11. (Original) The method of claim 10 wherein the step of providing communication capability comprises establishing Internet access for all of the entities.

12. (Previously presented) the method of claim 1 wherein an attribute comprises a limit of monetary expenditure in making a service request.

13. (Previously presented) The method of claim 11 further comprising the step assigning an attribute of authority to the user of a vendor entity.

14. (Previously presented) The method of claim 11 wherein the step of maintaining the status comprises a user of the vendor entity entering in the computer database the status of the fulfillment of the service request and communicating the status to the user of the entity requesting the service.

15. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1 further comprising the steps of:

assigning an Internet domain name to the property; and
accessing the data in a database over the Internet.

16. (Previously presented) The method of claim 3 wherein there are a plurality of properties owned by an owner entity having lease parameters established in a computer database.

17. (Previously presented) The method of claim 16 wherein a said plurality of said properties owned by an owner entity are managed by the same property manager entity.

18. (Previously presented) The method of claim 15 further comprising the steps of setting in a computer database data of an owner entity of each of the plurality of properties, data of a property manager of each of the plurality of properties, and data as to at least one tenant entity that occupies space in each of the plurality of properties.

19. (Previously presented) The method of claim 18 wherein the step of setting sets a user profile for at least one user of at least one of the owner entity, the property manager entity vendor entity and the tenant entity for each of the plurality of properties, and assigning at least one attribute of authority to each said user.

20. (Previously presented) The method of claim 14 wherein the status of the fulfillment of the service request is communicated to the property manager entity of the property.

21. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1 wherein the property manager entity and a vendor entity communicate by wireless.

22. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1 wherein a user of a tenant entity makes the request for a service and the request is routed by the tenant entity to a vendor entity.

23. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1 wherein a user of a tenant entity makes the request for a service to the property manager entity who in turn routes the request for service to a vendor entity.

24. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1 wherein a property manager entity makes the request for a service directly to a vendor entity.

25. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1 further comprising the step of programming a computer with scheduled requests for service; the computer generating the requests ; and routing the request to a vendor entity.

26. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1 further comprising the step of establishing a list of services available for the property in a computer database and attributing work processes and business rules to the various services of the list.

27. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1 wherein the property is an office building.

28. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1 wherein the vendor entity to whom the request is routed enters the status of fulfillment of the request into a database that is available to the user of the entity requesting the service.

29. (Currently amended) The method of claim ~~1~~ 10 wherein the vendor entity to whom the request is routed enters the status of fulfillment of the request into a database that is available to the user of the entity requesting the service.



Merriam-Webster OnLine

Merriam-Webster FOR KIDS

Encyclopedia BRITANNICA

Merriam-Webster ONLINE

Merriam-Webster COLLEGIATE

Merriam-Webster UNABRIDGED



HOME

PREMIUM SERVICES

M-WCollegiate.com
M-WUnabridged.com
Britannica.com
Multi-User Licenses

DOWNLOADS

WORD OF THE DAY

WORD GAMES

WORD FOR THE WISE

ONLINE STORE

HELP

Merriam-Webster Inc.
Company Information

Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary

4 entries found for **routing**.
To select an entry, click on it.
route[2,intransitive verb]
route[3,verb]
route[5,transitive verb]
route[2,transitive verb]

Main Entry: ²routeFunction: *transitive verb*Inflected Form(s): **route**-ed; **route**-ing1 : to send by a selected route : **DIRECT** <was *routed* along the scenic shore road>

2 : to divert in a specified direction

For More Information on "route" go to Britannica.comGet the Top 10 Search Results for "route"

Ads by Google

IP Route Analysis

Real time monitoring & analysis of EIGRP, OSPF, IS-IS, BGP networks
www.packetdesign.com

Toll Free Number Routing

Call Routing - NPA, NPA/NXX and ZipReal Time Account Management
www.1-800-telesmart.com

Hosted Softswitch

The Leader in Carrier Neutral Switching and VoIP Peering
www.gentel.net

Merriam-Webster Online

☒ Dictionary☐ Thesaurus

Ads by Google

Palm & Pocket PC

Browse and download
Merriam-Webster
e-books and games
for Palm and Pocket
PC PDAs and Mobile
Phones
[Merriam-Webster
Online Store](#)

Handheld Collegiate

Now you can take the
Eleventh Edition with
you anywhere as
Franklin's new
Speaking Electronic
Handheld!
Franklin.com/estore

Merriam-Webster
Collegiate.com
14-day Free Trial

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Merriam-Webster Online


http://merriam-webster.com/cgi-bin/dictionary?book=Dictionary&va...




Merriam-Webster OnLine

Merriam-Webster FOR KIDS Encyclopædia BRITANNICA

Merriam-Webster ONLINE Merriam-Webster COLLEGIATE® Merriam-Webster UNABRIDGED



Money Market National Average 1.17%



Open Account Today!
3.75%
Assumes \$100 on deposit
BankQuote.com National Average as of 10/17/05 MEMBER FDIC

HOME
PREMIUM SERVICES
M-WCollegiate.com
M-WUnabridged.com
Britannica.com
Multi-User Licenses



DOWNLOADS
WORD OF THE DAY
WORD GAMES
WORD FOR THE WISE
ONLINE STORE
HELP

Merriam-Webster Inc.
Company Information

Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary

Thesaurus

One entry found for submit.

Main Entry: **sub·mit** 
Pronunciation: s&b-'mit
Function: *verb*
Inflected Form(s): **sub·mit·ted**; **sub·mit·ting**
Etymology: Middle English *submitten*, from Latin *submittere* to lower, submit, from *sub-* + *mittere* to send
transitive senses
1 a : to yield to governance or authority b : to subject to a condition, treatment, or operation <the metal was *submitted* to analysis>
2 : to present or propose to another for review, consideration, or decision <*submit* a question to the court> <*submit* a bid on a contract> <*submit* a report>; also : to deliver formally <*submitted* my resignation>
3 : to put forward as an opinion or contention <we *submit* that the charge is not proved>
intransitive senses
1 a : to yield oneself to the authority or will of another : **SURRENDER** b : to permit oneself to be subjected to something <had to *submit* to surgery>
2 : to defer to or consent to abide by the opinion or authority of another
synonym see **YIELD**
- **sub·mit·tal**  /-'mi-t&l/ *noun*

For More Information on "submit" go to Britannica.com
Get the [Top 10 Search Results for "submit"](#)

Ads by Google

Google Sitemaps

Keep Google informed about your new web pages or updates - It's free
www.google.com/webmasters

Merriam-Webster Online

- ☒ Dictionary
- ☐ Thesaurus



Submit Find

Ads by Google

Palm & Pocket PC

Browse and download Merriam-Webster e-books and games for Palm and Pocket PC PDAs and Mobile Phones
[Merriam-Webster Online Store](#)

Handheld Collegiate

Now you can take the Eleventh Edition with you anywhere as Franklin's new Speaking Electronic Handheld!
Franklin.com/estore

Merriam-Webster
Collegiate
14-day Free Trial